PCC Ad-Hoc Task Group on Series Sunday June 24, 2007

In attendance:

Robert Bremer (OCLC) bremerr@oclc.org
Renette Davis (U of Chicago) rd13@midway.uchicago.edu
Peter Fletcher vinc9311@yahoo.com
Les Hawkins (LC) lhaw@loc.gov
Carl Horne (Indiana University) horne@indiana.edu
Joe Kiegel (University of Washington) kiegel@u.washington.edu
Judy Kuhagen (LC) jkuh@loc.gov
Kristin Lindlan (University of Washington) klindlan@u.washington.edu
Hien Nguyen (LC) hien@loc.gov
Kevin Randall (Northwestern) kmr@northwestern.edu
Robert Rendall (Columbia University) rr2205@columbia.edu
Gordana Ruth (University of Maryland) gr@umd.edu
Carolyn Sturtevant (LC) cast@loc.gov

1) The CONSER standard record (CSR) MARBI Group (CSR MARBI Group) has
collected some series proposals related to the CSR along with other proposals that they
are submitting to MARBI for ALA mid-winter (see appendix A).

Decision: PCC Series Review Task Group members agreed that series related MARBI
proposals from the PCC should be vetted and passed forward through one PCC channel.
The PCC Series Review Task Group therefore would like to take responsibility for
working on the proposals in appendix A in consultation with the CSR MARBI Group. At
a later meeting June 24th the CSR MARBI Group agreed to this and would like to be
kept up to date with progress on the proposals.

2) The PCC representative to CC:DA, Peter Fletcher has been working with CONSER
members and members of CC:DA on a series related rule revision. This revision proposal
resulted from a practice developed for the CSR (see appendix B). CC:DA discussed an
earlier draft of this proposal in February 2007 and decided not send it on to the JSC to
consider for inclusion in RDA. PCC Series Review Task Group members agreed that it
will be useful to make changes in the wording to provide a better justification. The
proposal could be useful for JSC's consideration for RDA, but the timeframe for getting
the proposal submitted to CC:DA is short and it will need to be submitted soon.

Action: PCC Series Review Task Group members will forward comments on the
wording in the proposal in appendix B to Peter Fletcher vinc9311@yahoo.com Peter will
need these comments as soon as possible, within the next two weeks or so.

3) General discussion: The group talked about the charge for the PCC Series Review
Task Force http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/SeriesReviewTF.html. The main goals
of the group are really embodied in the second specific task: Make recommendations on
changes in PCC series policies and documentation that result in simple, unified PCC

policies, procedures and series authority data elements in PCC records. Specific task one, gathering together previous and current recommendations for series will help us make decisions for reaching our recommendations for simplifying our practices and documentation related to series.

It was agreed that we should involve as wide a PCC audience as possible in commenting on series related recommendations. There are many NACO librarians not part of the CONSER and BIBCO programs contributing SARs, we should be sure to reach this audience also. It is also recognized that there are library communities not well represented within the PCC that will have an interest in the deliberations of this group, for example librarians cataloging children's literature and public libraries.

Decision: In gathering feedback on proposed recommendations, the group will be sure to take opportunities to gather feed back from the wider PCC community (i.e. PCC, BIBCO, CONSER email lists will be consulted) comments could also be sought from public library associations, auto-cat email list and other venues to assure as wide coverage as possible.

The group agreed to begin our work by gathering together the "grab-bag" of PCC related proposals that have been made throughout the years and begin vetting these to recommend simplified series practices. These should include the MARBI proposals suggested in appendix A, other series MARC coding changes proposed at ALA annual last year, proposals made several years ago by the PCC standing committee on training, and a series "cheat sheet" Judy Kuhagen developed. It was suggested that the PCC Series Review Task Force could use the PCC wiki as a place to work on vetting this "grab bag" list. After some sifting and vetting a more refined list could be presented on the PCC website to survey the wider cataloging community on their reactions.

Actions: Past proposals will be gathered into a "grab bag" list. Les has set up a space on the wiki for the PCC Series Review Task Force and sign group members up (the wiki, at least as its configured now is only viewable by registered users). The URL for the PCC wiki is http://www.loc.gov/extranet/wiki/library_services/pcc/index.php/Main_Page.

Judy Kuhagen will try to retrieve her series "cheat sheet" from her recently crashed hard drive.

4) Additional thoughts:

- Proposed series recommendations could be a topic for the ALA mid-winter at large meetings. A preliminary report is needed by November and should be posted to all relevant email lists.
- What about indexing and treatment of other elements given as series data such as other title information, variant titles, and parallel titles? There have been suggestions regarding the recording/tracing [?] of these titles in bibliographic records within the past year. We will need to show that we have thought about these issues and suggest the need to compensate for the loss of access for non-title elements.

- User surveys: it was mentioned that there are some user studies on series being pursued by several institutions. These might provide the PCC Series Review Task Force with useful information. Some at the meeting were concerned that a comprehensive evaluation of user studies is not in the purview of this group. However if the results of some known user studies are easily accessible and provide a "big picture" view of series use, this may be helpful in providing a comprehensive viewpoint.

Appendix A

CSR MARBI series related suggestions:

4XX/8XX fields:

> a. Always record a 490 and an 830, to separate description and access [avoid use of 440]. This may require the addition of a 1st indicator value for the 490 field to show that the tracing and the description are the same.
>
> b. Use only the 830 and add a subfield to be able to record the ISSN information related to the series.
>
> [Note: the CONSER standard record guidelines do not require transcribing the series statement in 4XX when traced, it is given only in 8XX field, usage is recorded in the SAR. If the series is not traced in a CONSER record, it is not coded as a CONSER standard record.]
>
> c. Add date subfields and relator subfields to 4XX/8XX series fields to indicate when a series was associated with a resource.
>
> [Note: the CSR MARBI Group has a similar proposal for the 7XX fields for adding dates to the 7XX field to indicate when a body was associated with a serial and would like to see these proposals prepared for MARBI's ALA mid-winter meeting. That would require that a MARBI proposal would be ready by early this fall? In relation to being able to indicate when a body was associated with a serial, the CSR MARBI Group seemed comfortable with simply defining a $i subfield for 7XX fields so that a clear statement could be made $i Issued 1995-2000 by: $a Body B… or something like that. I don't know if such an approach would work for showing when a series was associated with a resource.]

Appendix B

Memorandum

To: American Library Association, ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Peter Fletcher, PCC Liaison

Subject: Optional transcription of series statements in RDA 2.10.1.3

Background/Rationale

The CONSER standard record was developed to better meet user needs in the digital environment and emphasizes controlled access points over extensive descriptive detail, thereby reducing unessential or redundant elements. The CONSER standard record acknowledges that the controlled access points are the most useful and effective tools in the modern catalog.

Similarly, RDA has made some provision in this direction, for example, allowing for an option not to record a statement of responsibility in favor of creating a controlled access point:

2.4.0.3. Recording statements of responsibility

> ➢ Record statements of responsibility that relate to persons, families, or corporate bodies playing a major role in the creation or realization of the intellectual or artistic content of the resource.
>
> *Optionally*, in lieu of recording a statement of responsibility as a descriptive element, provide a controlled access point for the responsible person, family, or corporate body (see chapters 11–16).

Also, discussion of a recommendation similar to this proposal was initiated by me and several other CONSER members at CC:DA meetings at ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, WA last January. It was afterwards discussed (CC:DA/PCC/2007/1) and a motion endorsing it was defeated via email. The proposal was not properly and formally presented as a rule revision proposal to CC:DA, but sought to ad the proposal as an addendum to the Access level record for serials: Working Group final report, which was already forwarded by LC to the JSC for their consideration.

Related documents:

CONSER standard record documentation draft (5/30/07)
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/conserdoc.pdf

CC:DA/PCC/2007/1

Rule revision proposal:

2.10.1.3. Recording the title proper of the series

> ➢ If the resource is issued in a series, record the title proper of the series following the basic instructions on recording titles (see 2.3.0).

> [examples not shown]

> ◊ *Optionally,* in lieu of recording title proper of the series as a descriptive element, provide a controlled access point for series title (see chapters 11–16).

Clean copy of revised rule:

2.10.1.3. Recording the title proper of the series

> ➢ If the resource is issued in a series, record the title proper of the series following the basic instructions on recording titles (see 2.3.0).

> [examples not shown]

> ◊ *Optionally,* in lieu of recording title proper of the series as a descriptive element, provide a controlled access point for series title (see chapters 11–16).